

REMARKS

Claims 12, 13, 18-21, 25, 38-43, 59-63 and 69-76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Zeitman (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,481) in view of the Background of the application and further in view of DeLorme et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,948,040).

As noted in the Office Action, page 19, none of the references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest automatically determining a customer geographic location for the customer by a location-determining device in response to receipt of confirmation information, as recited by the claims. The Office Action states that the travel reservation and information system of DeLorme et al. is the equivalent. Since at least the feature of providing information "in response to receipt of the confirmation information" is an element completely missing from the references, however, it is inappropriate to discuss equivalents. In other words, the recited feature can't be the equivalent of a missing element. For example, a recited fastener may be the equivalent of a disclosed screw, but if the screw is not shown in the cited references there is nothing for the fastener to be equivalent to. In other words, the Office Action should cite a reference that shows the missing features in the context of the claims, otherwise allow the claims. The Office Action cannot merely state that the feature is equivalent to something clearly not shown, such as with regard to an explicit action in response to receiving confirmation information.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 14, 17 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zeitman, the Background and DeLorme et al. as applied to claim 12, and further in view of Yoshida (U.S. Patent No. 5,877,704).

Yoshida, alone or in combination with the other references, fails to disclose or suggest automatically determining a customer geographic location for the customer by a location-determining device in response to receipt of

confirmation information. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 14, 17 and 24 be withdrawn.


Claims 15 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zeitman and the Background, DeLorme et al. and further in view of Sehr (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,976).

Sehr alone or in combination with the other references, fails to disclose or suggest automatically determining a customer geographic location for the customer by a location-determining device in response to receipt of confirmation information. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 15 and 22 be withdrawn.

Claims 66-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zeitman, the Background and Applicant's purported admission of prior art. Claims 66-68 depend from claim 12, and since no new reference is being used with this rejection, these claims should be allowed at least for the reasons discussed above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 66-68 be withdrawn. Moreover, the Office Action has provided no reference to show these features, such as in the context of the claims, and therefore the features are clearly missing from the prior art with regard to the claims. For this additional reason, the rejections should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

For all of the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4224 if there are any outstanding issues that could be resolved through a telephone conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Vincent J. Gnoffo
Registration No. 44,714
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200